PATENT
09/843,063

D. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, remain pending herein.

Claims 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 26, 31, 32, have been canceled herein.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 11-18, 25, 29, and 31-34 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et al (Moore) US 2001/0039546A1. With respect to independent claims 1, 18, 28, 29, 33, 34 and each dependent claim therefrom, Moore does not teach the capturing of screen images as claimed. Moore appears to be capturing the objects themselves, the links, and or other data related to the objects. Moore also does not teach enabling a subsequent rendering of the stored screen images in succession in response to a user selection of a control button." Moore appears to be silent on the playing back of the stored objects other than discussed in paragraph [0053] and stating generally that the objects are stored for later perusal [0037]. Moore appears to also teach away from the claim element of storing each captured screen image in a chronological list by stating at [0044] that if the object had previously been captured, the existing object record is updated. As such, the new captured screen image would not be stored chronologically, but would have merely updated a previously stored screen image.

With respect to claim 2 as amended, Moored does not teach that the control button controls the rendering of the stored screen images by either a forward succession or a backward succession. Moore appears to be silent as to the playing back of the stored images.

AUS920010005US1   14

PATENT
09/843,063

With respect to claim 27, Moore does not teach that the sequence or succession

of each saved image is rendered at a rate predetermined by the user. Moore appears silent

as to how the images are rendered other than as previously discussed above.

The examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Moore et al [Moore, US 2001/0039546A1] in view of Parthasarathy et al

[6,412,013]. The examiner's position is not well founded. Parthasarathy teaches that a

node reads coded video data from the network at a predetermined rate. This teaches away

from Applicants' invention wherein the succession of captured screen images are rendered

at a user configurable rate. Applicants' claim 4 does not refer to the rate at which the

screen images are captured. Claim 4 refers to the rate in which the succession of captured

screen images are subsequently rendered. To the contrary, Parthasarathy teaches the rate

in which coded video is read from a network.

The examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, 19, 20 as being unpatentable over Moore in

view of Yano [US 2003/0037158A1]. Yano appears to teach determining a number of

video frames to be captured per unit of time. However, it appears that this determination

is not a user configurable rate, but one which is based on a receiver report transmitted

from the client. [0060]. For claims 6 and 20, Yano does not disclose the length of time

for the capture, much less that it is for a configurable duration of time. For these reasons,

and for the reasons discussed above with respect to the claims from which these claims

depend, claims 5, 6, 19, 20 are not obvious in view of the art cited.

PATENT
09/843,063

The examiner has rejected claims 7, 9, 21, 23, and 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore. These claims are indeed patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the claims from which these claims depend, or for the similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The examiner has rejected claims 8, 10, 22, 24, and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Lynch. These claims are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the claims from which they depend. Furthermore, Lynch merely discloses that dynamic HTML relies on the DOM to dynamically change the appearance of Web pages after they have been downloaded to a user's browser. Lynch fails to teach that the DOM is used to determine a change of content as a triggering event to capture the screen image. The examiner's position appears to be in error.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Smith Dawkins

Marilyn Smith Dawkins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,140
(512) 823-0094
AUS920010005US1

16